SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

AN

ANSWER

TO A

PAMPHLET,

CALLLED,

A Second LETTER to the PEOPLE.

(Price One Shilling.)

AN

ANSWER

TO A

PAMPHLET,

CALLED,

A Second LETTER to the PEOPLE.

In which the

SUBSIDIARY SYSTEM

IS

Fairly Stated, and amply Conſidered.

The SECOND EDITION Corrected.

A Fool is wiſer in his own Conceit, than Seven Men that render Reaſon.

LONDON:

Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe*, in *Pater-noſter-row.*

M. DCC. LV.

AC911.1755.A57

A N

A N S W E R

To a PAMPHLET called

A Second LETTER to the People.

IT is ſagely recorded in one of our Parliament Rolls, that a *Britiſh* Senator ought to be gifted with the three natural Properties of the Elephant, that is to ſay, he ſhould have no Gall, be always inflexible, and conſtantly ſupplied with a ready Memory. He ſhould have no Gall, I ſuppoſe, that his Opinion might be delivered without perſonal Bitterneſs and Rancour. He ſhould be always inflexible, that no Views or Conſiderations whatever might be able to ſuborn him from doing that Juſtice, which his Country requires at his Hands. And laſtly, he ſhould be adorned with a happy Memory, that by recollecting paſt Events, he might better judge of future Contingencies; or that by always retaining in his Mind the ſeveral Arguments of his Harangue, he might not be found to contradict in one Part of it, what he warmly aſſerted in another. Now, Sir, tho' I do not conſider you as having the Honour to be a Senator of this Kingdom, yet every Perſon preſuming to council the Public on any Bill pend-

ing in Parliament, before it has acquired that Sanction which only can enact it into a Law, I mean the "*Roi le veut*" (for we allow no Plebiſcitum in this Country) I ſay, every Perſon ſo advifing, may be conſidered as a kind of Volunteer, or *Would-be* Member of the Senate. But how far, and in what Degree you are poſſeſſed of the above-mentioned Qualifications, requiſite in you merely as a public Diſputant, your own Writings will too clearly evince. Yet leſt your miſchievous Miſrepreſentations may poſſibly impoſe upon your Readers, or leſt any of his Majeſty's Subjects ſhould adopt Principles of ſo pernicious a Tendency, I have examined your Letter with ſome Attention: For I thought it a Duty incumbent on me as a well-ordered Citizen, to ſtate Matters in their true Light, that, by thus expoſing the Abſurdity of your Notions in political Affairs, I might happily undeceive thoſe, whom your Miſinformations might unwarily have miſled.

I muſt premiſe before-hand, and I hope you can't take it amiſs, that wherever I meet with a Period in your Letter, tho' ever ſo harmonious to the Ear, yet if it conveys no Idea to the Mind, and is nothing but an idly-ſounding Verbiage, you muſt excuſe me, if I call it little better than Nonſenſe. And I am greatly apprehenſive indeed the very firſt, and very long-winded Period of your Letter comes under this Predicament, at leaſt I will not take upon me to pronounce it intelligible; but to juſtify myſelf of any Partiality againſt you, I here tranſcribe it Word for Word. "In "all Governments conſtituted like this, of which "you have the good Fortune to be born Mem"bers, where *the Legiſlative Power is the People's* "*Right*, and the Executive belongs to the King, "indeed, wherever it is of the mix'd Kind, it

is

" is impoſſible, from the changeable Nature of " all human Inſtitutions, but the Balance which " ought to be preſerved between the *Prince and* " *the Subject* muſt be deſtroy'd, and the Scale " preponderate ſometimes on one Side, and ſome- " times on the other." Was there ever ſuch a Jumble of Words? Such a total Deprivation of Ideas, or rather ſuch a Chaos of confus'd Thoughts? It reminds me indeed of an humorous Paſſage in *Nat Lee*, where, ſpeaking of a horrid palpable Obſcurity, much reſembling this of your's, he makes

His Gods meet Gods, and joſtle *in the Dark.*

But beſides this unpardonable Want of Perſpicuity at firſt ſetting out, was there ever ſo glaring a Falſity to aſſert, that *the Legiſlative Power is the People's Right.* The Legiſlature of *Great Britain* is a tripartite Inſtitution, conſiſting of King, Lords, and Commons, conjunctively. How then can it be ſaid to be *ſingly* the People's Right..

Page the ſecond, " whoever ſhall have Forti- " tude enough to expoſe *the pernicious Deſigns of* " *a wicked Miniſter*, muſt ever be eſteemed by all " good Men, as the Lover of his Country, and " Friend of Mankind." Now it either follows from hence, that the Duke of *Newcaſtle* (for his Grace undoubtedly is the *Primum Mobile* of the whole Adminiſtration) is a wicked Miniſter, and his Deſigns pernicious, or what you have advanced muſt paſs for Words of no Signification, mere Cyphers, and nothing elſe. If you have Recourſe to the latter Suppoſition, which is an apparent Subterfuge, you are highly culpable for daring to amuſe the Public with empty Prattle, and idle Impertinence. If you frankly avow the former, then are you liable to be tried as a defa-

matory Writer. So that take, it either Way, you have brought yourſelf into a Situation equally dangerous: If you are *Cinna* the Conſpirator, you deſerve a ſevere Chaſtiſement from the Hands of the Law: If you are *Cinna* the Author, I ſhall cry out with the Mob,

(——————— *et eſt ubi Vulgus*
Interdum recte videt———)

Tear him to Pieces for his execrable Libels.

Page the third, you ſay, " *One Half of either* " *Side* of that vaſt and ſolid Arch which ſuſtains " a *whole Nation*, being weakened by undermining " the whole which it ſupported, without ſudden " Help, tumbles into everlaſting Ruin." This may be true in Theory; but I don't remember ever to have ſeen an Arch *ſo* conſtructed, that *one Half* of it only ſhould ſupport the *whole* ſuper-inducted Column or Edifice: If ſo, then I ſhould think the *other Half* would be entirely needleſs; and if it tumbled into everlaſting Ruin, or not, it would no ways affect or injure the Superſtructure. It is plain, from this Obſervation, that you are not only ignorant of the firſt Rudiments of mechanic as well as of political Architecture, but that the very Rule, by which you pretend to ſquare this vaſt and ſolid Arch, is erroneous in itſelf. For you compare the Conſtitution of *Great Britain* to a Building ſuſtained by two Props only, the King and People, whereas, for Propriety's Sake, you ought to have reſembled it to a *Scalenum Triangle*, whoſe three Sides are all unequal, and admirably well denote the three different Powers of the King, Lords, and Commons. But falſe, or at leaſt uncertain Deductions will always be the Conſequence of comparing Things together, which are heterogeneous in their own Natures. The

well

well known Story of our blind Profeſſor *Saunderſon* is a convincing Proof of this; for, being aſk'd, what he thought the Colour of Scarlet moſt reſembled? he immediately anſwered, that, to his Conception, it bore a very near Reſemblance to the Sound of a Trumpet. What is this but playing at Croſs-queſtions with our Children in their Nurſeries? And whether we be mathematical Profeſſors, or profeſs'd pamphleteering Authors, if our Notions are ſo totally unform'd, or uninforming, we ought to keep them to ourſelves; or if we are reſolv'd the Publick ſhall hear them, the greateſt Favour to which we can be intitled, is, the Fate of *Shakeſpeare*'s *Midſummer Cuckoo*; that is, *to be heard—not regarded.*

In the ſame Page you ſay, "*Both Extreams* of "Anarchy in the People, and Deſpotiſm in the "King, being prov'd by the Hiſtories of thoſe "Times to be alike fatal to the King and Subject, "all poſſible Care ſhould be taken to prevent "ſuch Evils." And why? The Reaſon you give is as extravagant and foreign as ever enter'd into the Cerebellum of a Madman. It is no more than this, we ought to prevent Anarchy in the *People*, and Deſpotiſm in the *King*, leſt the *Lords* ſhould fix themſelves in abſolute Power, which they are at preſent attempting. But to act fairly by you, I will here tranſcribe your own Words, "All poſ-"ſible Care ſhould be taken to prevent ſuch "Evils, and early too, before *the heated Ambition* "*of a few* ſhall dare to plunge the Nation into "the Abyſs of Confuſion and Diſtreſs, *by Attempts* "*to fix* themſelves *in abſolute Power*" Now having previouſly mentioned *both Extreams*, Anarchy in the People, and Deſpotiſm in the King, whom can we ſuppoſe *thoſe ambition-heated few to be, that are attempting to fix* themſelves *in abſolute Power*, but

but the Peers of this Realm, the only *Medium* I know of between King and People. If I might be permitted to ſpeak my Mind on this Point, I ſhould think the Power of the Lords very little to be ſuſpected at this Juncture, nor can I readily perſuade myſelf that I am ſingular in this Opinion.

Page the fourth we are told, that "whoever "dares to aſſert, that an *Engliſhman* has no Right "to oppoſe the *exorbitant* Power of a Prince "upon the Throne is an Advocate for Paſſive "Obedience, and an Enemy to the Revolution." I grant that an *Engliſhman*, under certain Reſtrictions may have ſuch a Right: But then he is not like another *Matthias*, (*vid. Selden, de Zelotis*) to ruſh upon him, and ſlay him at the Altar. A Zeal of this Nature I imagine would not be accounted to him for Righteouſneſs in any Court of *Europe* at this Day. If a Monarch is to be oppoſed, it ought to be done with the Sanction and Authority of thoſe Laws which he himſelf has ſubſcribed; and even then with all the Reſpect and Deference due to his ſuper-eminent Dignity. For as to all other Oppoſitions, it is obvious to Perſons of common Diſcernment, that they are only the natural Effects of a diſaffected Heart, or a diſappointed Ambition. But, inſtead of allowing this Conceſſion, I might aſk you, to what Intent is it that you inform the People of this Nation, that "an *Engliſhman* has a Right to oppoſe the *exor-* "*bitant* Power of a Prince upon the Throne?" Would you caſt any ſuch Reflection on his preſent Majeſty? The Word *exorbitant* implies, that the King has acted *ex orbe*, out of his Sphere. If you will make uſe of Words that have a Meaning, why don't you produce Facts to corroborate, or confirm, what you ſeem ſo deſirous of maintaining? Can you charge his Majeſty with having made

any

any one Encroachment upon the Liberties of the People, or the Privileges of the Peers? If you could, you certainly would have ſpecified it with no ſmall Degree of Malevolence, and not have deliver'd yourſelf in ſuch general Terms, as, " deſpotic Deſigns, gigantic Strides, to ſubvert " the Laws, change the eſtabliſh'd Religion, and " ſet up arbitrary Power on its Ruins." All which are Phraſes, I muſt own, thunder out a fine rumbling, grumbling Sound, like that of a Drum, which poſſibly may aſſemble a numerous Populace together, but I hope not one of them will prove ſo diſloyal, as to enliſt under ſo factious a Standard.

In the ſame Page we are informed, (and who cou'd have thought it?) " the Commons of *Eng-* " *land* are the Repreſentatives of the People." Prodigious!

——— *ô mirà calliditate virum!*

Is not this ſearching into the very Bottom of the Well after Truth? Is not this equal to the diſcovering an *Achilles* in a Boarding-School? Or a Sir *John Falſtaff* in a Buck Baſket?

Page the fifth exhibits to our View another Period of a pretty moderate Length, containing juſt ſixteen Lines, which conſiſts of Prerogatives, Conſtituents, M———r fleecing the Millions to enrich Hundreds, iniquitouſly betraying Country-men, and I know not what all: but the Winding-up has ſomething in it highly entertaining. I will here publiſh it, in the Letter-Writer's expreſs Phraſeology: " Shall I, your Fellow-Subject, be " condemned for *knocking at your Breaſt*, and " awakening thoſe Hearts within which (hear " him, hear him,) ſleep ſupinely inattentive to " their Country's Danger." No; though the Heads

Heads of all the Colleges in the Univerſity of *Oxford*, convened even in *Golgotha*, were to pronounce this to be *Engliſh*, I would not believe them; nay, I ſhould argue againſt them till Doomſday, but for that ſaving Clauſe in the *Acta Eruditorum*, "*non diſputandum eſt contra Maccabæos.*"

The next three or four Paragraphs are a direct Plagiariſm from Mr. *Hobs*, wretchedly botch'd together. However I ſhall beg Leave, *en paſſant*, to animadvert upon one Word, which I think conveys to us a lively Idea of the ridiculous Appearance an Author muſt frequently make, who writes upon a Subject far ſuperior to his Abilities, and in a Language that he does not thoroughly underſtand. The Paſſage I would mention is that, where, addreſſing himſelf to the People, he thus harangues them. "Ye are Inheritors of the "Conſtitution of this Realm from your Fathers, "and are bound by all the Ties of Nature and "of Juſtice, to deliver it entire to your Sons; "many of whom being yet *unborn*, or too young "to *bequeath* Power to the Repreſentatives of the "Nation, cannot juſtly, by their Predeceſſors, be "deprived of the moſt valuable of all Inheri-"tances, their Liberty." This whole Thought was originally the Property of Mr. *Addiſon*, and in moſt elegant Language has he handed it down to us in his Tragedy of *Cato*; but our Letter-writer has a clever Hand at borrowing a Hint, and making it his own, in a manner almoſt peculiar to himſelf;

Nam male dum recitas, incipit eſſe tuum.

But not to inſiſt too much on this Point, nor yet to ſcrutinize too minutely that happy *Concetto* of our owing a Duty to Perſons many Years before they are actually *in Eſſe*; I ſay, not to pry too ſcrupulouſly into ſuch Eleuſy-

nian

nian Myſteries, I ſhould be glad to know ſomething of our Sons that really are *in Eſſe*, but as yet too young to *bequeath* Power to the Repreſentatives of this Nation For my own Part I always underſtood, that a Legatee could never receive any Legacy *bequeathed* to him, till the Death of the Bequeather; and what Power that can be, which the Repreſentatives of the Nation receive merely by the Death of any young Man, I am at a Loſs to determine, or even to conjecture.

Page the eighth, we are now going to combat againſt Metaphor and Allegory, two Antagoniſts mighty pompous and furious in their firſt Aſſault, yet very apt to give Way, when oppoſed by calm Reflection and ſound Judgment. But hark! the Hour of Attack approaches, and thus the figurative Champion begins. " Ought not that Nation " which, unremonſtrating, permits her Servants " to aſſaſſinate her, or *runs on that Sword* which " ſhe has given into the Hands of others for Pro- " tection, *though ſhe does not ſtab herſelf*, to be " deemed equally guilty of *Suicide*, with Men " who commit that unnatural Act." I muſt obſerve here, that to run upon a Sword, and not to ſtab oneſelf, is an evident Mark of extraordinary Good-luck: It is at leaſt *Point*, *Quint*, and *Quatorze* younger Hand, and the Odds at *Arthur*'s would be full ſixty to one againſt you: But then not to ſtab oneſelf, and yet be deemed guilty of Suicide, and buried as ſuch, ſavours a little of the Paradox: Beſides, it would be ſtraining the Letter and Intention of the Law a Note or two above Concert-pitch: For I thought it always a conſtant Maxim in all Courts of Judicature to interpret in Favour of the Delinquent, where the Circumſtances were not of an atrocious Nature: But *Baſta* for that; for of what Significance ought

any Law to be, that is enacted (as you ſay) by Perſons choſen contrary to Law.

Page 13. " The Acts of an *Engliſh* Parliament, whenever they ſhall be arbitrary, and the " deſpotic Mandates of a *Perſian* Sophi, *are equally* " *tyrannical.*" Still ſplitting on the Rock of Compariſon: And why is the *Perſian* Monarch to be lugged in as a Tyrant? Surely thoſe only are Acts of Tyranny, which are oppreſſively enacted contrary to the eſtabliſhed Laws of a Country: But the *Perſian* Empire acknowledges the Will of their Sovereign as a Law, therefore his royal Mandates can in no Senſe be deemed tyrannical. But to ſhew this Argument of our Author, in its proper Light, I will ſtate it ſyllogiſtically.

The Acts of an *Engliſh* Parliament, and the deſpotic Mandates of a *Perſian* Sophi, are *equally* tyrannical.

But the deſpotic Mandates of a *Perſian* Sophi are not tyrannical.

Therefore the Acts of an *Engliſh* Parliament are not tyrannical.

In the ſame Page you ſay, " It may eaſily " happen that a *Miniſter* may *dictate* as deſpoticly " as a Sophi." Which Expreſſion I imagine contains a ſmall Contradiction in Terms. For, to *dictate*, is *lawfully to* command ſuch Perſons as have no reſerved inherent Right to diſobey. But, if the Senate of *Great Britain* have a Right to give a negative Voice, no one can then properly be ſaid to *dictate* to them: Much leſs a *Miniſter*, for that is a Term of ſubordinate Condition: But to dictate is the Office of one legally inveſted with ſupream Power, therefore a Miniſter can no more be a Dictator, than a Dictator can be a Miniſter. They are Incompatibilities *in ſe*. But Inaccuracies and

and Improprieties of this kind are continually falling from the Pen of a *middling* Author. Which is a Fault the more inexcuſable, as in the *Britiſh* Language every Idea has its appropriate Term. From whence it happens, that if we indiſcriminately make uſe of Words ever ſo little above, or ever ſo little under Par, we may frequently have the Misfortune to ſay one Thing, when we mean another, which, by a ſpecial Figure in Rhetorick, is called Abſurdity. But Men in Proportion to their Love of Garrulity, are generally, as *Horace* obſerves,

——— *Pigri ferre laborem*
Scribendi rectè.———

Page 18. " *Whoever* then ſhall endeavour to " ſet in a clear Light the Utility or Deſtruction " which may follow from a Law before it is " enacted, will undoubtedly be conſidered with " a favourable Eye." This is a Conceſſion, I believe, that will not altogether ſo eaſily be granted. For the Word *Whoever* is a Term of very extenſive Latitude, and implies a general Rule without one Exception. Now with Reſpect to judicial Examinations, it is wiſely provided by our Laws, that no Weight or Regard whatever ſhall be given to the Evidence of *certain Perſons*. And doubtleſs the ſame Objections lie againſt *certain Authors*. For in order that an Author be *favorably* heard, it is neceſſary that he either be a Perſon of known Probity, or that the Facts which he relates be indiſputably true. If by the Virulence or Scurrility of his Writings he becomes ſuſpicious of Partiality, his Teſtimony ought no more to be conſidered, than that of a *Britiſh* Outlaw, or a *Spaniſh Borachio*. Beſides, in giving our Advice on Matters of ſuch Importance, as

thoſe that are the immediate Objects of Parliamentary Debate, it is required of us, that at leaſt we comport ourſelves with Temper, Decency, and Reſpect. But what can we think of a Writer's Impartiality, who would give the Nation to underſtand, and that too by Inuendo's impoſſible to be miſtaken, " that his Sovereign is not only ſecretly aiming at deſpotic Power, but actually taking gigantic Strides to ſubvert the Laws, and change the eſtabliſhed Religion: That the Houſe of Commons are choſen contrary to the Conſtitution of the Kingdom; and that conſequently all their Proceedings are illegal: That the Prime-Miniſter is not only weak in Head, but wicked at Heart." And what are we to expect from the great Moderation obſerved in the following Paragraphs. " The pernicious Deſigns of a wicked Miniſter. A Miniſter fleecing Millions, and betraying his Countrymen. Him that miſguides his King and Country in the Adminiſtration. A Miniſter may dictate as deſpoticly as a Sophi. How will that Miniſter defend himſelf, who though perhaps without the Subtilty of the Serpent, may like that Reptile transfuſe his Poiſon through a Houſe of Commons, to the Ruin of his native Land. Hydra-headed Miniſter. If a Suſpicion of a wicked Deſign may be imagined to be blended in the ſame Head of the Miniſter. Siniſter Management of a Miniſter. The arbitrary Will of a Miniſter. How abſurd muſt be the Head of a Miniſter, who can cheriſh ſuch Conceptions. It is the Weakneſs of our Miniſtry. Thus then, conſcious of the Imbecility of our Miniſter, they reap the plenteous Harveſt of his buſy Folly. Thus then nothing but miniſterial Wrongheadedneſs. Point your legal Deſigns alone againſt that Miniſter, who betraying the Truſt, which is committed

mitted to him, by his Maſter. A Miniſter of weak Intellects, *&c. &c. &c.*" Who can peruſe ſuch common-place Calumny and Detraction, without calling to mind that admirable Diſtich, in which it is laid down as a ſelf-evident Propoſition, tho' indeed upon a different Occaſion, that

Immodeſt Words admit of no Defence,
And want of Decency, is want of Senſe.

Yet this is the Man, ουτος εκεινος, *hic Vir, hic eſt*, that propoſes to ſtate the national Concernments in a *clear* Light, and aſſures himſelf, that he has an undoubted Right to be conſidered by the Public with a *favorable Eye*. But he that firſt cries out, "No Quarter," certainly, by the Law of Retaliation, is entitled to no Quarter himſelf.

We come now to thoſe very ſolid Reaſons, which this Letter-writer advances to diſſuade the Nation from taking foreign Troops into *Britiſh* Pay. And firſt he ſays, Page 21, "The Money with which the Aid of a mercenary Army is purchas'd, muſt be a Diminution of the Wealth of that Kingdom which pays them, and therefore detrimental, as it leſſens the pecuniary Strength of the People." To which I anſwer, that the ſubſidiſing foreign Troops is a Step never taken out of mere Wantonneſs: It is a Meaſure, like many others, which all Governments are obliged to comply with *per* Force, and ſuch a Conduct becomes prudent, becauſe neceſſary. It is in Fact only ſuſtaining a preſent Diſadvantage, to reap a future Benefit. And if there are Sums of Money that muſt neceſſarily go out of this Kingdom on that Account, we ſhould conſider on the other hand, what immenſe Treaſures *France* muſt be continually drain'd of in Subſidies, which that Court pays to the King of *Sweeden*, *Denmark*, and *Pruſſia*; and

and, as is generally believed, to the Electors of *Cologn* and *Manheim*, the Duke of *Parma*, and the Republic of *Genoa*. To which, of a Certainty may be added, the thirty thouſand *Swiſs*, which that King conſtantly maintains in the very Heart of his Country. Likewiſe the two Sols *per Diem* which he allows to every Roman Catholic Male *Swiſs* from the Day of its Birth. So that if we can diſtreſs *France*, much more than we diſ-benefit ourſelves, we ſhall be gaining the great Point, which every *Briton* has now in View; I mean the Security of our *American* Colonies. For it would be to no Purpoſe to be conſtantly ſending freſh Reinforcements to the New-world, if we did not firſt appoint proper Checks upon the Power of *France* in *Europe*. In order to do this *effectually*, it became neceſſary to have great Allies. Hence the prudent Fore-ſight of his Majeſty engaged the King of *Sardinia* into his Intereſt by the Treaty of *Worms*, to annoy the Houſe of *France*, as Occaſions ſhould offer, on the Confines of *Dauphiny*. How great too was the Wiſdom of our King, in riveting, as it were, ſo firm an Alliance with the Houſe of *Auſtria*. For by this Means, *France* is continually kept in Awe on that Side of her Dominions which border on the *Auſtrian* Territories. If the *French* King held it requiſite to ſubſidize the Courts of *Cologn* and *Manheim*, the King of *Great Britain* inſtantly thought it adviſeable to throw into the oppoſite Scale the Courts of *Dreſden* and *Munich*. But the *French* King, to over-reach us in Politics, and over-power us in Numbers, had gained over to his Intereſt a very formidable Acquiſition indeed. Every one muſt ſee that I can mean no other than the King of *Pruſſia*. To counterbalance ſo great a Weight, What Meaſure could the King of *Great Britain* judiciouſly purſue? To

have

have ſent a *Britiſh* Army into *Germany*, would not only have been to ſend an Army at double if not treble the Expence, but it would at leaſt have been endangering the Lives of forty or fifty thouſand of our moſt valuable Subjects. And there are few, really Well-wiſhers to their Country, who would not at any Time rather ſee a Million of Guineas tranſported to *Germany* and *Ruſſia*, which probably may refluctuate again into this Iſland, than an Army of fifty thouſand *Britons* quitting their native Country, perhaps never to reviſit it again. What then had his Majeſty to do? Or indeed what could Wiſdom or paternal Affection have planned out with more Diſcernment, or greater Tenderneſs towards his Subjects? Why? His Majeſty from great Experience in Political Affairs, and conſummate as he is in all Military Knowledge, perceived it abſolutely neceſſary to have a ſuitable Counterpoize againſt the Force of *Pruſſia*. I ſay a *ſuitable Counterpoize*, for twice the Number of *Spaniards* would not ſo efficaciouſly have anſwered the Intent, as Seventy Thouſand *Ruſſians* now can do. For theſe *Ruſſians* are not, as it is induſtriouſly and maliciouſly rumoured, to come into *Great Britain:* But in caſe the Forces at *Berlin* are any ways turbulent in *Germany*, then are the *Ruſſians* to ravage and lay waſte the King of *Pruſſia*'s regal Dominions. Thus we ſee, by our Sovereign's extenſive Fore-judgment, the *French* King is held at Bay from every Quarter. He has a numerous Army that dares not take the Field; he has a ſplendid Navy that dares not quit the Harbour. What muſt then be the Conſequence? Why, our Fleets will ruin their Shipping, their Merchants will turn Bankrupts, and our Colonies in *America* be firmly eſtabliſhed. Let no one then pretend to clamour

out,

out, that our naval Armaments are merely raiſed for the Protection of *Hanover*, that *Hanover* is the ſole Cauſe of our going to War with *France*. No, it is the over-grown Power of that Nation, and the rapid Progreſs the *French* are continually making in their Commerce, that forces us into a War. But, at leaſt, thus much may be ſaid of the *Hanoverian*, that he is a hearty Ally, that he gallantly ſtood by us in the Day of Battle, and deſerves our warmeſt Returns of Gratitude and Friendſhip.

As to your ſecond and third Objections, they only alledge in general, "that mercenary Troops muſt for ever be deficient in that animating Spirit, which is called Courage, and that they are juſtly ſuſpected to be within the Reach of pecuniary Corruption." In anſwer to this unſupported, unjuſt Aſſertion, I ſhall refer you to a Paſſage of *Cicero*, in his Book of *Invention*, where he ſays, *eſt quædam Argumentatio, in quâ nihil valet abſque approbatione.* But you was in the Right to decline advancing any corroborative Proof, ſince the Practice and Reputation of mercenary Troops is too well eſtabliſhed all over *Europe* to be called in Queſtion. Have they not all a military Credit to maintain? Do they not particularly pique themſelves upon Points and Sentiments of Honour? Were the Thirty Thouſand *Switzers*, I mentioned above, ever known ſhamefully to deſert their Poſts on any Account whatever, or were the *French* ever known to ſuſpect their perſonal Bravery? Does not the King of *Spain* conſtantly engage Six or Seven Thouſand *Switzers* in his Service? Nay, does not he give them almoſt tripple the Pay of his own national Troops? And has he not punctually paid them by the Month, at a Time when he was obliged to reduce his own Soldiery to Half-pay?

pay? Call but to mind the ſpirited Behaviour of the *Iriſh* Brigade! The ſevere Duty they ſuſtain'd, and the ſignal Service they did in the Battle of *Fontainoye*, leaves us ſurely little Room to doubt either the Courage or Utility of hired Forces. Thus having plainly proved the Inconſiſtancy of your third and fourth Objections, all the Arguments drawn from thoſe Premiſes naturally fall to the Ground. *Cum principalis cauſa non conſiſtit, nec ea quidem, quæ ſequuntur, locum habent* *.

Your fourth Objection is, "that a hireling Army once victorious, perceiving the People who invited them to their Aſſiſtance, *unequal to the Taſk of defending themſelves*, and reſiſting their Force, will, in all Probability, ſet up for themſelves, and become their Maſters." Both this and the following Objection are entirely removed, by only declaring that it is neither the Intention of his Majeſty nor of his Miniſters, that the *Ruſſian* Army ſhall ſet Foot on *Britiſh* Ground. Beſides, allowing they were actually to come over into this Iſland, certainly *we ſhall not be unequal to the Taſk of defending ourſelves*, and reſiſting ſo trifling a Force: ſince you know we can at any Time, "without the Aſſiſtance of *Scotland* or *Ireland*, raiſe One Million Two Hundred Thouſand SOLDIERS in a few Hours: And if that Number is not ſufficient, we can raiſe, with the Aſſiſtance of *Scotland* and *Ireland*, in a few Days, according to your moſt accurate Calculation, Two Millions of Men *able* and willing to bear Arms in their King and Country's Defence." So that I defy the *Ruſſians*, and the *French* King into the Bargain, be his Armies ever ſo numerous, to make

* *Paulus, l.* 19, *ad Edictum.*

Head againſt ſo formidable a Power. It would be ridiculous, as you afterwards very judiciouſly obſerve, to offer at any ſuch Attempt, " the Abſurdity would glare through the thin Diſguiſe, and be viſible to the weakeſt Underſtanding." And indeed this ſuper-excellent Plan for raiſing Two Millions of *able Soldiers* in ſo ſhort a Space of Time, ſeems to me ſo rational, that I am perfectly amazed you ſhould entertain any Suſpicion like what you mention in Page twenty-nine " perhaps ſome Man of more Turbulence than Judgment, the *humble* but *violent* Retailer of miniſterial Falſhood, may treat this long Diſquiſition as a Lunatic Scrole of a Bedlamite." On my firſt Peruſal of this Paſſage, I ſaid indeed I was amazed, but then I ought to have conſidered the whole Sentence collectively, and my Wonder would conſequently have ceaſed. For though a Perſon to be ſure might treat this Diquiſion of your's as a Lunatic Scrole of a Bedlamite, yet no one but a *violently-humble*, or *humbly-violent* Retailer of miniſterial Falſhood could well be guilty of ſo prepoſterous a Miſ-judgment; and what ſignifies, you know, the Wrongheadedneſs of Retailers of Miniſterial Falſhood, their buſy Folly will never change the Nature of Right and Wrong: In ſpite of all their Cavalling, " this View of our Situation, as you wiſely remark, beyond all Contradion ſets Things in a *new* Light." For my own Part, I'm convinc'd that it ſets Things not only in a *new*, but in ſo advantageous a Light, that I have been extreamly cautious of adopting any Words, but ſuch as you yourſelf have been pleaſed expreſsly to make uſe of on this ſingular Occaſion. For as you are unqueſtionably the firſt that ever invented ſo expeditious a Method of raiſing an Army of Two Millions of *able Soldiers*,

diers, and as you have, like a true-ſpirited *Briton*, offered it to the Public, without Fee, Profit, or Reward, it is but juſt you ſhould reap all the Honour accruing from ſo noble, uſeful, and practicable a Project; it would indeed be a Kind of *Rei-publicæ Læſa-majeſtas* to rob you of a Tittle, in Thought, Word, or Deed. To juſtify myſelf of ſuch Deſign, I have ſervilely copied you Word for Word.

Page 33, the Letter-writer gives us the following Muſter-roll of mercenary Forces, taken, *as he ſays*, into *Britiſh* Pay.

Hanoverians, —— ——	16,000
Saxons, —— —— ——	12,000
Heſſians, —— —— ——	12,000
Saxe-Gothians, —— ——	6,000
Bavarians, —— ——	8,000
Wolfenbutlers, —— ——	5,000
Darmſtadians, —— ——	4,000
Piedmonteſe, —— ——	30,000
Ruſſians, —— ——	73,000
	166,000

Would not any one imagine, that this candid Author, who flatters himſelf that he ought to be conſidered with a favourable Eye, becauſe he has no other View, but that of ſetting Matters *in a clear Light:* Would not any one, I ſay, imagine, that every Article of this long Muſter-roll was accurate and authentic? Indeed had he only miſcounted twelve Thouſand inſtead of ten Thouſand *Heſſians*, or eight Thouſand inſtead of ſix Thouſand *Bavarians*, even ſuch a Miſtake had been unpardonable. But what Opinion muſt we entertain of his Veracity, when the two firſt Articles of his Account are wholly and abſolutely falſe?

For, of all those Sixteen Thousand *Hanoverians*, there is not One in *British* Pay; nor as yet have we entered into a fresh Treaty with the King of *Poland*; for the old Subsidy between us and the Court of *Dresden* is expired: And as to the *Piedmontese*, *Saxe-Gothians*, *Wolfenbutlers*, and *Darmstadians*, his Majesty, in his Speech from the Throne, makes no mention of having entered into any Subsidiary Engagements with them. *Thus then* (to use his favourite conclusive Phrase) it is evident this Letter-writer, this seditious Disturber of public Quiet, has openly asserted, as a Matter of Fact, what can have no other Foundation than that of idle Rumour, or his own ill-intentioned Conjectures. But not contented with publishing so gross an Untruth, he farther endeavours to instigate and incense the People of *Great Britain* against the present Government, by persuading them, that we hire the Troops of those very Princes merely to defend their own Territories. Whereas we have hired them with no other View, as I before observed, but to keep the *French* King in Awe upon the Continent, whilst we are harrassing him at Sea, and ruining his Commerce in *America*. But these are Views too extensive for the common Perceptions of Mankind, they have Optics indeed, but then can only

Inspect a Mite, not comprehend the Heav'n.

Whoever writes on a System, so far only as relates to a Part, will be continually advancing Arguments that are prejudicial to the Whole. The *British* Empire at present, as it consists of a great Variety of Connections, is of a very intricate Nature, and none but such as have been gradually promoted

promoted from one Employment to another, can have an adequate Idea of its different Intereſts: Intereſts frequently claſhing, nay wholly incompatible one with the other, and yet both at the ſame Time perhaps equally deſerving of Protection. In Caſes thus equiponderating, a temporary Preference muſt be given to the one; and it may ſo happen, that it muſt be given in ſuch a manner, as apparently to diſbenefit the other. Points of this Nature are daily riſing in the Management of public Affairs, which would greatly perplex any one that was a Novice in the common Courſe of Buſineſs. Hence it is, that Perſons who never were in the Cabinet, are frequently apt to form very wild Notions of thoſe that are in the Adminiſtration. And the Reaſon is obvious, for when an Object is ſeen through a falſe Medium, it is always groſsly miſrepreſented. This leads me naturally to enquire, Sir, whether you yourſelf ever had the honour to be employed in any public Station, or whether you ever was entruſted with the Secrets of the Privy Council? If not, be perſuaded that you are only blundering on in the Dark, while you pretend to be ſetting Matters in a *clear Light*. Take then a friendly Advice, and have nothing more to do with political Diſcuſſions: I ſhould think indeed you muſt certainly ſucceed in the Novel Writing. For in a Kingdom of Romance, was you to raiſe two or three Millions of *able Soldiers*, and that too on a ſudden Start, the Novelty and Surprize would in all Probability highly entertain your Readers; but was you to raiſe half that Number in the Kingdom of *Great Britain*, it might be attended with very dangerous Conſequences. For it is not natural to ſuppoſe, an Army would long remain obedient to the civil

civil Authority, when they had it ſo greatly in their Power to eſtabliſh a military Government.

With reſpect to the Seventy-three Thouſand *Pruſſians*, it is uncontradictably manifeſt they are taken into *Britiſh* Pay by our Sovereign, ſolely as King of *Great Britain*. For as Elector of *Hanover* there is a Treaty ſtill ſubſiſting; by which the *Czarina* agrees to furniſh that Electorate with a ſufficient Body of Troops in caſe of Danger. This perhaps is a Circumſtance not generally known, but it does not follow that it is therefore the leſs true. However it is a plain Proof, at leaſt in my Opinion, that his Majeſty has no other View but the Intereſt and Welfare of *Great Britain*, by entering into this judicious Alliance with the Court of *Peterſbourg*.

Page 37. The Letter-writer comes now to give us ſome Extracts from our own Hiſtories, to ſhew, that the Territories of our Kings in *France* were by no Means to be defended at the Expence of *Engliſh* Treaſure: The firſt Example he produces is, that "the Earls of *Hertford*, *Bohun*, and *Bigot* (he ſhould have ſaid *Bohun* Earl of *Hereford* and *Eſſex*, two Titles in one and the ſame Perſon) began their Commotions through the Diſtaſte which *Edward* the Firſt gave them, by demanding their *Service* in the Quarrel of *Gaſcony* (he means *Guienne*) and in denying to defend or recover foreign Provinces independent of *England*, tho' ſubject to the King." This Quotation is quite alien to a *Britiſh* Parliament's not granting Subſidies; for in this very Caſe, *Edward* obtained the Conſent of his Parliament to raiſe the *octavum Denarium a Populo*, the eighth Penny from the People, as *Walſingham* has it. Nor did the Earls of *Hereford* and *Bigot* refuſe to advance their Quota, or

or *Service*," arising from Lands which they held as Tenants *in Capite*: But they refused to go into *Guienne* in Person; alledging as a sufficient Reason that their Lands (which were of feudatory Tenure) were obliged indeed to perform military *Service* in the King's Wars, but that they themselves were not obliged to perform *personal Service* in any War, unless the King was *personally* there himself; adding farther, that they were ready and willing to attend the King into *Flanders*, for which Country his Majesty was then embarking, but that they must persist in not going so far from the *Royal Person*, as into the Province of *Guienne*, their Lands requiring of them no such *Service*, and the Employments which they held, the one being Constable, the other Earl-Marshal of *England*, demanding their personal Attendance on the King.

Let us then examine the other Witnesses this *impartial* Author introduces; Page 38, he says, "In the twentieth Year of the Reign of *Richard* the Second, the sixth and ninth of *Henry* the Fourth, the first and seventh of *Henry* the Fifth, it is affirmed, the Commons of *England* are not bound *pour supporter les guerre en la terre de France, ou en Normandie*; the Commons of *England* are not bound to support the King's Wars in *France* or *Normandy*, publickly declaring this, and publickly refusing Assistance." From this over-loaded, ostentatious Paragraph, would not any one naturally conclude, that these three Kings had applied to Parliament for Subsidies, and that their Parliaments had absolutely refused to grant them? Yet such is the Insufficiency of the Letter-writer's Testimony, that in every one of the Instances above cited, the Parliament granted the Subsidy required by each respective King. The Complaint against

Richard

Richard the Second was of quite a different Nature, and took its Riſe, not from his Parliament refuſing to grant him Money, but in that having obtained very large Sums in a legal Parliamentary Proceſs, he immediately afterwards exacted a heavy Contribution from each wealthy Individual of the Nation, under the Name of a Benevolence or free Gift. For there was not, as *Rapin* obſerves, a Lord, Prelate, Gentleman, or rich Citizen, but was obliged to lend a Sum of Money, though they knew the King had no Deſign ever to repay them.

In the ſame Page, we are told, that "*Edward* the Firſt was refuſed Money by his Subjects, to defend his Territories in *France* againſt the *French*." In this Caſe, as well as in thoſe already mentioned, the Author happens to be wrong in his Evidence; for the Parliament in this very Inſtance granted the Subſidy that *Edward* demanded. But to ſhew how willing our impartial Letter-writer is to foiſt-in any the leaſt Appearance of a Negative from the Parliament againſt the King, I will explain this remarkable Epoque of our *Engliſh* Hiſtory. In the Year 1297, *Edward* the Firſt convoked a Parliament at St. *Edmund's Bury*, in which a large Subſidy was granted to him, for the Service of the enſuing Year. But as the Intentions of the King were publickly known, ſome Time before the Parliament was called, the Clergy privately obtained an Edict from Pope *Boniface*, inhibiting them, under Pain of Excommunication, from paying any Tax or Contribution whatever to any ſecular Prince. So that when the King came to levy the Monies granted to him by Parliament, the Clergy (who then poſſeſſed One-third of the Revenues of this Kingdom) alledged in

Excuſe

Excuſe for their Non-compliance the Conſtitution of Pope *Boniface*. But the King, who was not ſo eaſily to be lulled aſleep, withdrew his Protection from the Clergy in general, and inſtantly began to imbreviate the Lands and Effects belonging to the Archbiſhop. On which the Clergy, with their Archbiſhop at their Head, humbly petitioned the King to be reſtored to his Royal Favour, and readily gave him Four Shillings in the Pound, *Regi ſuorum bonorum dederunt quintam partem.* And it is this ſubtil, tho' unſucceſsful Temerity in the Clergy, which our Letter-writer is pleas'd to call "a Refuſal in the Subjects to defend the King's Territories in *France* againſt the *French*."

Page 39. "The Poll-money impoſed by Parliament in the Reign of *Richard* the Second, to defray the Expence of the Wars in *France*, was the Cauſe of bitter Imprecations againſt the King, which were followed by an Inſurrection of the Commons." It was not the Poll-tax that irritated the Commons of *England*, but the brutal Manner in which it was collected by the *Flemiſh* Farmers; and every one knows that the Inſurrection which afterwards happened was not owing to the Inſult that was offered to *Wat Tyler*'s Daughter, for the People of *Kent* and *Eſſex* had been in a Ferment long before the Poll-money was levied. This Circumſtance was merely an intervening Incident, but the real Cauſes of the Peoples breaking out into an open Rebellion, were, among many others, the great Ravages that were committed in *Eſſex* and *Kent*, by the frequent Deſcents of the *French*; and extremely incenſed indeed were the Commons againſt the Duke of *Lancaſter*, who was charged with cauſing, by his Negligence, all the Calamities

the two Counties had endured. So that this very Precedent is a Caſe in Point which might be brought not only in Juſtification, but in Commendation of the great Vigilance and prudent Conduct of the preſent Adminiſtration, who have already taken thoſe Meaſures, which the Duke of *Lancaſter* is cenſured for having neglected.

In the ſame Page our Author tells us, "that in the Reign of this King (*Richard* the Second) the Parliament was ſo tender in granting Subſidies and raiſing Taxes for foreign Wars, that they added to the Act, *Quod non trahatur in conſequentiam*, that it ſhould be no Precedent to Futurity for levying Taxes." It will not be amiſs here to obſerve, that this Parliament took extraordinary Care that the Subſidy they granted ſhould be applied *only* in repulſing the *French* and *Caſtilians* in League againſt *England*; ſo that I ſhould think this Parliament can't properly be ſaid to have been *tender in granting Subſidies for foreign Wars*. As to the Scrap of *Latin* which our Letter-writer has ventured to inſert, and which, thro' Ignorance of the Language, I ſuppoſe, he has tortured into quite a different Meaning, I will give my Readers its proper Explanation. The Parliament declared the Subſidy granted to the King, who was then a Minor, ſhould not be drawn into a Precedent, which plainly ſhewed, ſays *Rapin*, that they were reſolved to be upon their Guard *during the King's Minority*.

I cannot ſay I am thoroughly ſatisfied with the Comment of this Hiſtorian; I ſhall offer a Remark of my own, which is, that the Parliament, knowing the *Neceſſity* of oppoſing the *French* and *Caſtilians*, granted the Subſidy; but clogg'd it

it with this Caveat, *Quod non trahatur in conſequentiam*, merely to ſhew, that they diſtinguiſhed it from other Supplies, as a Meaſure of Neceſſity. For it is a well-known Maxim in the Civil Law "*Neceſſitate factum, non trahitur in conſequentiam*;" or, in the Words of *Paulus*, "*quæ propter neceſſitatem recepta ſunt, non debent in argumentum trahi* *."

Page 47. "Shall this Kingdom be totally drained, by grievous Subſidies, in Support of foreign Princes Dominions, among whom there is One, whoſe untold Sums lie *uſeleſs and untouch'd*, even for the Protection of that State which is ſo dear to him." This is a new Species of protecting, at leaſt I never heard before of Money being eſteemed any kind of Protection to a Country, while it lay *uſeleſs and untouch'd*. But tho' we are not to expect correct Writing from ſo unacademical a Scribbler, yet certainly a Decency is due from every Writer when he ſpeaks of a Crown'd Head; but in this laſt Paragraph of yours it would be difficult to determine whether the Badneſs of your *Engliſh*, or the Badneſs of your Heart, be the more perſpicuous. However, Sir, if you have the good Luck to eſcape a corporal Chaſtiſement, impute it not altogether to the Lenity of the preſent Adminiſtration, but attribute it in ſome Meaſure to the real Service you do the Miniſter and the Crown, by attacking them with ſuch Impotence of Argument, that even the very Fauters of your Party muſt begin to be aſhamed not only of their Advocate, but even of the Cauſe itſelf, which they have ſo obſtinately, and unwittingly, eſpouſed. I ſay, you have done the Government ſome Service; for certainly it is no ſlender Proof

* *Paulus, l. 72. ad Edictum.*

that an Oak is firmly rooted in the Soil, when we ſee it remain unſhaken and unmov'd, notwithſtanding the continual Bluſterings of a North-Eaſt Wind.

Page 41. " During the Wars of *William* and *Anne*, and in our Times, we have thrown *Three Millions of* Engliſh *Money* into the Scale of that Balance of Power in *Germany*, and yet it does not incline to our Side." Is not this a plain Intimation for us to throw a Million or two more into that ſame Scale? Yet I muſt own that Three Hundred Millions of Pounds Sterling is a pretty, decent, comfortable, round Sum.

Quando ullum invenies Parem?

But then our *German* Allies are ſo much the wealthier for it; and if our Letter-writer's Calculation be juſt, (which he aſſures us it is) it may then truely be ſaid of *Great Britain*, that ſhe is not only rich in herſelf, but the Cauſe that Riches are in others.

Page 49. " There is yet a farther Conſideration, for our declining to engage in *German* Welfare, it is the Defence of his Majeſty and his Subjects Poſſeſſions in *America*, *the living Fountain of perpetual Wealth to this Kingdom*, an Object worth ALL our Conſideration; whatever is expended in the Defence of *Engliſh* Plantations returns to *England* again." At laſt our Letter writer has unknowingly blundered upon the main Point the Miniſtry has in View, the great Object that Demands *all* their Conſideration. And this is the *ſole* Reaſon, as I before obſerved, that we have neceſſarily incurr'd ſo great an Expence on the Continent in *Europe*. But theſe are Politics of too refined a Texture for the groſſer Perceptions of the common Run of Mankind,

kind, who ſee no Object in its full Force and Vigour, unleſs it be primarily and immediately before their Eyes. If it be ever ſo little removed, or ſeen thro' the miniaturing End of the Perſpective Glaſs, it either wholly eſcapes their Sight, or appears to them a mere Minutity. Thus when a Miniſter tells them, his chief and ſole Deſign is to aggrandize our Strength in *America*, they have no Idea that it is previouſly neceſſary to put a Curb on the headſtrong, ambitious Power of *France*: And whatever Steps he may take to keep that Nation in Awe, will by theſe ſhort-ſighted, bleareyd Politicians be pronounced *prepoſterous*, *fooliſh*, *wrong-headed*, *iniquitous*, *and abſurd*. And there can be no Excuſe alledged as a ſufficient Argument in Favour of ſuch Perſons, but that which *Ulpianus* pleads in their Behalf, *non videntur*, *qui errant*, *conſentire*. (Ulp. l. 11. ad Edictum) Vid. p. 35, 36, 48, 34.

Page 50. " Shall that *Baſtard* and *unnatural* State (a moſt polite and reſpectful Paraphraſe for *Hanover*) continue to exhauſt our Wealth in her Defence and Service, and the legal Child of *England* be neglected and abandoned in her Diſtreſs?" In the preceding Paragraph I have amply ſhewn, that ſo far from neglecting and abandoning our legitimate Child, that it is the ſole Concernment of the preſent Adminiſtration to foſter it up with all poſſible Tenderneſs and Attention. I ſhould think our late Succeſs under General *Johnſon*, the long Continuance of Admiral *Boſcawen*'s Fleet in thoſe Parts, and the great Number of Ships ſtill left in that Country, is a ſufficient Proof of our Miniſter's great Care and Deſire effectually to protect our Plantations. But what this Letter-writer means by ſaying, that *Hanover* ſtands in Relation

to

to us, as a *Baſtard* and *Unnatural* Child, I muſt own I can't well divine. For I always underſtood a *Baſtard* or a *Natural* Child, to be ſynonymous Terms. If then *Hanover* be as a Baſtard Child to us, then is it alſo as a Natural Child; and if Natural, conſequently not Unnatural. But this is one of the many Specimens I could produce, to elucidate how greatly our Author excels in that kind of Writing, which may not improperly be called the *Chiaro-Oſcuro*, or Clear-Obſcure *.

Page 55. "Let me therefore implore you, if it ſhould ever be the abject Fate of *England*, to become the Slave of *Germany*, urge not your Reſentment beyond remonſtrating to your Repreſentatives and Sovereign your deſpicable Situation, with-hold your Hands *from vindicating your own Rights*." You may remember at the Beginning of this Anſwer to your Letter I ſaid, that every Perſon who diſcuſſes Parliamentary Debates, ought to be gifted with the Memory of the Elephant, in order that he ſhould not contradict in one Part of his Diſcourſe, what he warmly aſcertained in another. And how juſt that Remark was, you here ſufficiently confirm. For in this Paragraph above, you implore the People to with-hold their Hands *from vindicating their own Rights*; and in the third Page of your Letter, you tell them, when the Preſervation of their Liberties is the Point in Conteſt, they ſhould then *again attempt to vindicate their Advantages* of their happy Conſtitution, by removing their King from the Crown. But what Judgment can any one pretend to form of

* We call that Offspring a Baſtard or *natural* Child, whoſe Parents liv'd, as it were, in a State of *Nature*, or rather not conformably to the *civil* Inſtitution of Marriage.

of the ſyſtematic Doctrines of a Satyr, that can faſhion his Mouth to blow hot and cold, in one and the ſame Moment.

Page 55. " Will ye, degenerate Men, behold *Britannia*, like *Prometheus* chain'd to a Rock, whilſt the *German* Eagle is devouring her Vitals? Believe me, the Moment of that Cataſtrophe may not be at a great Diſtance, when it arrives I ſhall not fail to give you Warning of the Evil." As to the firſt Part of this Paragraph it muſt be obſerved, that the Liver of *Prometheus* never ſuffered the minuteſt Decreaſe, but as often as the Vulture feaſted upon it, ſo often did the Liver inſtantaneouſly recruit itſelf afreſh: Now if we recover our vital Strength as faſt as the *German* can be ſuppoſed to devour it, and if we perceive no Diminution, I am for giving my Vote to keep fattening on this Eagle of *Germany*, at leaſt till he becomes an equal Match againſt the Cock of *France*. As to the latter Part of this Paragraph, that you will give us Warning of the Evil when it arrives, it has ſo much of the good old Woman in it, that it reminds me of a ſhrewd Remark *Scarron* makes in his *Virgil Traveſti*. The *Latin* Poet cries out in the Shades below,

Diſcite juſtitiam moniti, et non temnere Divos.

The *French* Poet gives us an humorous Parady in the following Diſtich,

Cette Sentence eſt bonne et belle:
Mais en enfer de quoi ſert elle?

Which applied to you may be tranſlated thus, " What the Devil ſignifies the giving us Warning, when it is too late to follow any Advice at all?"

Thus,

Thus, Sir, have I examined the Letter, which you addreſs to the People of *England*. A Letter of ſuch incendiary Documents, abounding with ſuch perſonal Invectives, and falſe Aſſertions, that was you to be called to an Account, it would be impoſſible for the Laws of the Land not to condemn you, it would be incompatible with the Royal Favour to ſhew you the leaſt Glimpſe of Mercy. And yet how neceſſary is it, for good Government, that the Monarch on his Throne, and his Miniſtry in their Cabinet, be ſhelter'd as it were from the poiſonous Arrows of Scandal and Detraction? Their Characters ſhould be ſacred as their Perſons. But if every half-ſtarved impertinent Scribbler be permitted to tell the *one*, that he is taking gigantic Strides to ſubvert the Religion and the Laws of the Country, and impudently to declare, that the *other* is forming Deſigns that are iniquitous, fooliſh, prepoſterous, and abſurd, certainly we may ſay, with *Cicero*,

Actum eſt de republicâ.

A Weed of ſo deſtructive a Quality ſhould not be truſted to run to Seed. To connive at the Raſhneſs of one, is giving others Encouragement to be equally audacious. Beſides, this Perſon ſhould by no Means eſcape a public Cenſure, for his Crime carries with it a voluntary premeditated Guilt; he publiſhes a Firſt Letter to tell you, that *he will only ſhew the Weakneſs of the Miniſter*; *but promiſes his Second Letter ſhall expoſe the Iniquity of that Miniſter*. Would the Republick of *Poland*, the States of *Holland*, or any Country where Liberty is moſt preſum'd to flouriſh, ſuffer the Printer or Author of ſo infamous and calumniating a Promiſe

miſe to go unpuniſh'd? But as the preſent Miniſtry ſeems to think theſe virulent Penmen not worth their Notice, or leaſt Conſideration, I will here adjoin a Fable, that depicts this whole Neſt of Hornets in their proper Colours. I make no Apology for the Introduction of the Fable, as it an Honour to the *Britiſh* Nation to have produced ſo eminent a Poet.

The OAK and DUNGHILL.

ON a fair Mead a Dunghill lay
That rotting ſmoakt, and ſtunk away,
To an exceſſive Bigneſs grown,
By Night-mens Labour on him thrown.
Ten thouſand Nettles from him ſprung,
Whoever came but near, was ſtung,
Nor ever fail'd he to produce,
The baneful Hemlock's deadly Juice:
Such as of old at *Athens* grew,
When Patriots thought it *Phocion*'s due:
And for the Man its Poiſon preſt,
Whoſe Merit ſhone above the reſt.
Not far from hence ſtrong-rooted ſtood
A ſturdy Oak, itſelf a Wood!
With friendly Height o'ertopt the Grove,
And look'd the Fav'rite Tree of Jove:
Beneath his hoſpitable Shade,
The Shepherds all at Leiſure play'd;
They fear'd no Storms of Hail or Rain,
His Boughs protected all the Plain.
Gave Verdure to the Graſs around,
And beautify'd the neighbouring Ground.

The gracious Landlord joy'd to ſee,
The proſperous Vigour of his Tree,
And often fought when in Diſtreſs,
This Oak's oracular Redreſs,
Sprung from the old *Dodonian* Grove,
Which told to Men the Will of *Jove*.
His Boughs he oft with Chaplets crown'd,
With *azure Ribbons* girt them round,
And there, in Golden Letters, wrought,
Ill to the Man, who Evil Thought.
With envious rage, the Dunghill view'd
Merit with Honour thus purſu'd,
Th' Injuſtice of the Times he moan'd,
With inward Jealouſy he groan'd,
A Voice at length pierc'd thro' the Smoke,
And thus the Patriot Dunghill ſpoke.
If a proud Look fore-run a Fall,
And Inſolence for Vengeance call,
Doſt thou not dread inſulting Oak!
The juſt th' impending Hatchet's Stroke?
When all the Farmers of the Town,
Shall come with Joy to pull thee down,
And wear thy Leaves all blythe and gay,
Some happy RESTORATION Day.
For 'tis reſerved to thoſe good Times,
To puniſh all thy matchleſs Crimes.
Beyond the *Alps*, my Mind now ſees
The Man, ſhall fell ſuch Traytor Trees.
To Heav'n 'tis true thy Branches grow,
But thy Roots ſtretch to Hell below.
Oh! that my Utt'rance cou'd keep Pace
In curſing thee and all thy Race!
Thou Plunderer! grown rich by Crimes,
Thou *Wolſey* of theſe modern Times!
Thou curſt *Sejanus* of the Plain!
Thou Slave of a *Tiberian* Reign!

Empſon

Empſon and *Dudley!* Star and Garter!——
A *Knez!* a *Menzicoff!* a *Tartar!*——
Th' aſtoniſh'd Farmers all around
Stood gaping, at th' impetuous Sound;
The Dunghill in high Triumph lay,
And ſwore the Oak had nought to ſay.
His Work was done——The Farmers all
Might gather round, and ſee him fall.
Not ſo th' Event——The Oak was ſeen
To flouriſh more, in fuller Green.
By Scandal unprovok'd he ſtood,
And anſwer'd thus the Heap of Mud.
When Folly, Noiſe, and Slander rage,
And Calumny reforms the Age,
They in the Wiſe no Paſſions raiſe,
Their Clamours turn to real Praiſe.
Yet ſure, hard-fated is the Tree,
Reduc'd to ſpatter Dirt with thee.
Soon ſhou'd a Branch from off my Side
Chaſtiſe thy Inſolence and Pride,
Did not the Wiſe obtain their Ends,
As well from Enemies, as Friends.
Thus ſome Encreaſe thy Heap receives,
Ev'n from the falling of my Leaves;
Which, like falſe Friends, when dropt from me
Aſſimulate, and turn to Thee.
But be they thine—New Seaſons ſpread
New Honours, o'er my riſing Head.

F I N I S.